

REMARKS

The Examiner's action dated March 18, 2008, has been received, and its contents carefully noted.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

During the personal interview held with examiner Ralis on June 16, 2008, the contribution of the present invention and the manner in which it distinguishes over the prior art were discussed. It was pointed out, in particular, that the iron according to the invention includes a part having, as one component, a downwardly extending rib that limits the iron steam chamber laterally, this rib being sealed to the soleplate in order to close the steam chamber. During the interview, there was a tentative agreement that this feature is not disclosed in the references of record. The examiner further indicated that if the claims are being amended, the next action, if it is not an allowance, will not be made final

* * * *

By the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended to provide the limitations discussed during the interview. Clear support for these limitations will be found in the present specification, at page 5, lines 21-23 and 26-31.

The primary applied reference, Cuzel, discloses a part 11 that forms the lower wall of a water reservoir but does not include any component, such as a downwardly extending rib, that would limit the underlying steam chamber laterally. In the prior art, an iron containing the water reservoir disclosed in the applied reference would include a metal soleplate having upwardly extending ribs that laterally limit the steam chamber. As pointed out in the present

specification, at page 1, lines 21-26, the result is that the structure of such a soleplate cannot be simplified.

This deficiency in the disclosure of the primary reference is not supplied by the disclosure of the secondary reference, Santiago.

Thus, a steam iron according to the present invention can be manufactured more economically than prior art irons and claim 1 now clearly distinguishes over the applied references at least by its recitation that the part having multiple functions "comprises a downwardly extending rib that limits the steam chamber laterally, and the iron further comprises at least one seal between the rib and the soleplate".

Claim 2 further defines the structure of irons according to the invention by its recitation that the iron includes a water reservoir having a bottom constituted by the part with multiple functions.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that the previous rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, that claims 1-3, 7, 10, 13 and 16 be allowed and that the application be found in allowable condition.

Appln. No. 10/547,337
Amd. dated June 18, 2008
Reply to Office Action of March 18, 2008

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /jmf/
Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:smb:tdd
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\S\seb\Gelus5\Pto\2007-12-19-amendment.doc